

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 14-20, 23-25, 27-29 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcos et al., U.S. patent 6,347,342 B1 (“Marcos”) in view of Taylor (see PTO-892 mailed 22 August 2006). Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcos in view of Taylor and further in view of U.S. patent No. 6,230, 117 (“Lymer”). Claims 9 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcos in view of Taylor and further in view of the NPL reference Tannenbaum. Applicants submit that no new matter was introduced in the amendment to the claims. Claims 1, 7, 14, 23 and 32 have been amended in this response.

### **Interview Summary**

On August 23, 2007, Examiners William Thomson and Nathan Price and Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiners Thomson and Price agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 14-20, 23-25, 27-29 and 32-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcos in view of Taylor. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcos in view of Taylor and further in view of Lymer. Claims 9 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcos in view of Taylor and further in view of Tannenbaum.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite in part “***said first conversion performed using a host initiated processing (HIP) system that includes one or more listeners for receiving the first request and one or more HIP proxies that handle flow control for the first conversion, the number of listeners and HIP proxies to use in the first conversion is determined by an HIP runtime service based on pre-stored configuration information***”. The other independent claims 14, 23 and 32 have been amended in similar

fashion. Support for this amendment can be found for example in Fig. 6 and the accompanying discussion found starting in paragraph [0044] through [0048].

The cited Marcos, Taylor, Lymer and Tannenbaum references taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest a host initiated processing system as now recited in all of the independent claims which includes one or more listeners and one or more HIP proxies which work to handle the conversion with the number of listeners and HIP proxies being selected by a HIP runtime service. Although Marcos is concerned with translation between protocols, it fails to teach or suggest an HIP system that includes one or more listeners and HIP proxies whose numbers are selected by an HIP runtime service as now claimed. The other cited references also fail to teach or suggest such a system. Furthermore, as mentioned in the previous response, the use of a header usable with an Internet protocol to represent information contained in the FMH7 field is something that is neither taught or suggested by the references individually or combined. For these reasons, applicants submit that claims 1-11, 14-20, 23-29 and 32-36 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

**DOCKET NO.:** 303999.1 / MSFT-1961  
**Application No.:** 10/610,689  
**Office Action Dated:** February 27, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: August 24, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439